



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/656,147	09/08/2003	Takashi Maeda	242519US0CONT	1370
22850	7590	09/26/2008		
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			EXAMINER HENDRICKSON, STUART L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1793	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/26/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

RECORD OF ORAL HEARING
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte TAKASHI MAEDA,
YUJI KAWABUCHI,
TAKAHIRO HAGA
and TOMIJI HOSOTSUBO

Appeal 2008-3647
Application 10/656,147
Technology Center 1700

Oral Hearing Held: August 13, 2008

Before EDWARD C. KIMLIN, THOMAS A WALTZ, and
CATHERINE Q. TIMM, Administrative Patent Judges

ON BEHALF OF THE APPELLANT:

CHARLES J. ANDRES, JR., Ph.D., ESQUIRE
Oblon, Spivak, McClelland, Maier &
Neustadt, P.C.
1940 Duke Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 412-6457

1 The above-entitled matter came on for hearing on Wednesday,
2 August 13, 2008, commencing at 2:40 p.m., at the U.S. Patent and
3 Trademark Office, 600 Dulany Street, Alexandria, Virginia, before Victoria
4 L. Wilson, Notary Registration No. 269770, Notary Public.

5 THE USHER: Calendar number 26. Mr. Andres.

6 JUDGE KIMLIN: Good afternoon, Mr. Andres.

7 MR. ANDRES: Good afternoon, your Honors. May it please
8 the board, my name is Charles Andres. I am here on behalf of The
9 Appliance Motor Company, Limited. We appreciate the opportunity to have
10 our appeal heard. Thank you.

11 JUDGE KIMLIN: You are more than welcome. You might
12 want to spell your name for the transcriber.

13 MR. ANDRES: A-N-D-R-E-S, Charles.

14 I would like to start off by expanding one of the arguments that
15 we made that there is no motivation to combine the references.

16 In Claims 10 and 11, there is a feature in both of the methods
17 that there is a charging a constant current density increasing voltage until the
18 voltage exceeds 2.5 volts up to 3.5 volts and then discharging at constant
19 current density.

20 This feature is not described or suggested by the primary
21 reference, Maeda, and in Anani, which the office has relied on for a charging
22 scheme, there is at column 5, lines 47 through 54, a paragraph which states,
23 "The capacitor portion of the electrical energy storage device was scanned,"
24 and it goes on and talks about the scanning.

25 And then it further goes on to say, "It is important to note that
26 this material's combination would yield a capacitance much higher than

1 realized from a conventional carbon double layer capacitor. This is due, in
2 part, to the fact that the potential of the nickel electrode does not vary
3 significantly during the potentiostatic sweep."

4 And so in the case of Maeda, you have a carbon-carbon
5 capacitor and the office is trying to graft this method of Anani onto the
6 carbon-carbon capacity of Maeda. First of all, Maeda only needs to go up to
7 2 volts and gets very good results in terms of the capacitance.

8 JUDGE TIMM: Doesn't Maeda disclose going up to 3 volts?

9 MR. ANDRES: Maeda does disclose the possibility of going
10 up to 3 volts. All the examples of Maeda are at 2 volts, however.

11 And so if Maeda at 2 volts or at 3 volts, even, gets very good
12 capacitor capacitance without resorting to this constant current charging
13 scheme, then why would one of ordinary skill in the art be motivated to
14 bring in this constant current charging scheme of, say, Anani when Anani
15 specifically talks about the fact that part of what makes Anani so good is that
16 instead of having a carbon-carbon capacitor, it has a carbon-metal capacitor.

17 JUDGE TIMM: Well, doesn't Anani give -- provide some
18 evidence that it is known to charge these things with a constant current,
19 these types of capacitors?

20 MR. ANDRES: Anani provides, I think, some evidence that it
21 is known to charge capacitors that have a -- two different materials for the
22 electrodes at a constant current.

23 I wouldn't necessarily broaden what the reference teaches to its
24 known generally to do this and even if it were known, there is still no
25 motivation to bring this into Maeda because Maeda gets such good results,
26 why would anyone be motivated to alter?

1 JUDGE TIMM: Does Maeda tell us how he is charging the
2 capacitor?

3 MR. ANDRES: Maeda merely says he charges to 2 volts, as I
4 recall, in the experimental.

5 JUDGE TIMM: So we really don't know whether it is a
6 variable current or a constant current.

7 MR. ANDRES: That is correct.

8 JUDGE TIMM: There is a disclosure in column 11 of a
9 measurement of discharge capacity which talks about constant current
10 discharge.

11 MR. ANDRES: Right, but that still doesn't mean constant
12 current charge.

13 I would like to make one more argument concerning Claim 10,
14 if that's okay.

15 Elaborating on our not suggesting all the features of the present
16 invention, the present invention, the presently claimed inventive
17 embodiment in Claim 10, has an activated carbon fiber with pores that
18 consist essentially of micropores having an average pore radius of .2 to 1
19 nanometer.

20 Although Claim 10 starts out with the term "comprising," the
21 specific step, step 2, Roman numeral II, employs the term "consisting
22 essentially of," which means that the carbon fibers in this case can't have an
23 average pore radius outside of the stated range of .2 to 1 nanometer unless
24 that somehow does not alter the composition.

25 JUDGE TIMM: Do you make this argument in your brief or
26 your reply brief?

1 MR. ANDRES: We did not exactly make this argument, no,
2 but it falls under the heading of a general argument we made that not all the
3 features of the present invention are described or suggested and so I thought
4 it would be appropriate to -- to expand upon that.

5 JUDGE TIMM: It is really not something the examiner has
6 been able to address.

7 MR. ANDRES: I see. I understand your point. Thank you.

8 In Maeda, at column 4, lines 22 through 26, there are two
9 different types of pores as shown by the two different types of pore radii.
10 There is a radii of .4 to 1.5 nanometers and a second pore type that has a
11 radii of 3.6 to 6 nanometers.

12 In this -- both of these are required in the fibers of Maeda as
13 shown at column 8, lines 42 through 48, where it is described that when the
14 ratio of the pore surface area of the larger pores to the pore surface area of
15 the smaller pores is less than .01, it is likely that charge capacity is not
16 increased for specific surface area.

17 Further, if one examines the examples of Maeda, one can see,
18 for instance, at table 1, which is at columns 13 and 14, that as this surface
19 area -- as these pores that are very large increase in terms of the percentage
20 of the composition of Maeda, that the capacity of the capacitor also
21 increases, so there is a direct correlation.

22 There is also some correlation between the surface area
23 increasing, as well, and so there is probably some interplay between
24 increasing the surface area and increasing the pore size.

25 However, in the current specification, at page 32, last
26 paragraph, it is described that the use of an active carbon fiber with an

1 average pore radius of over 1 nanometer makes it difficult to attain the
2 effective increasing charge and discharge capabilities.

3 And at table 1, page 41 of the originally filed specification,
4 when the average pore radius increases from .82 nanometers to 1.05
5 nanometers, the capacity percent increase drops to zero.

6 And so one of ordinary skill in the art would understand from
7 reading Maeda that the pores of having an average pore radius of 3.6 to 6
8 nanometers must be present and that as you increase the number of these
9 pores, the capacity of the resulting capacitor increases.

10 In contrast, present Claim 10 has the radius of the pores limited
11 to an average radius of .2 to 1 nanometer and going beyond this hinders the
12 goal of increasing charge and discharge capabilities as shown by example
13 one versus comparative example one at page 41 of the originally filed
14 specification.

15 That's it. Do you have any further questions?

16 JUDGE TIMM: No further questions.

17 JUDGE WALTZ: No, I have none.

18 MR. ANDRES: Thank you very much.

19 JUDGE KIMLIN: Thank you for coming.

20 Whereupon, the proceedings at 2:50 p.m. were concluded.